

## **II. REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed October 18, 2007, the Examiner: (1) objected to Figures 1-5 for improper labeling; and (2) required restriction of the application into one of two groups identified by the Examiner for prosecution.

### **A. Response to the Objection to the Figures**

Applicants have included a set of properly labeled replacement drawings with this response. Applicants request that the Examiner's objection to the figures be withdrawn in light of the newly submitted replacement drawings.

### **B. Response to the Restriction Requirement**

The Examiner required restriction of this application to one of two groups, which the Examiner identified as: (1) Group 1, corresponding to Figures 6-11 and 13a; and (2) Group 2, corresponding to Figures 12 and 13b. (Office Action, p. 2)

In compliance with MPEP § 818, Applicants elect Group 1 corresponding to claims 1-11 and 13-20 without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of the non-elected group in a divisional application. Additionally, Applicants further reserve the right to reinstate the currently withdrawn dependent claim directed to species for which a generic claim is allowed.

### **C. Explanation of Amendment to Claim 7**

Applicants have amended claim 7 to correct a typographical error.

## **III. CONCLUSION**

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. Should the Examiner feel that further dialog would advance the subject application to issuance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 913-2104.

Respectfully submitted,  
McDonnell Bochen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: December 17, 2007

By: /Jeffrey P. Armstrong /  
Jeffrey P. Armstrong  
Reg. No. 54,967